

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of APRIL SUE LORENZ, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

AMY LYNN JACKSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ROBERT LORENZ,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of KAYLA KRISTIE JACKSON,  
Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

AMY LYNN JACKSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

VICTOR THOMPSON,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

July 17, 2003

No. 246316

Saginaw Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 01-027308

No. 246317

Saginaw Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 01-027309

Before: Zahra, P.J., and Talbot and Owens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court orders terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i), (c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), and (j). We affirm.

Respondent-appellant argues that she was denied the effective assistance of counsel by her attorney's performance. We review this issue de novo. *In re CR*, 250 Mich App 185, 197; 646 NW2d 506 (2002). The principles of effective assistance of counsel developed in criminal law apply by analogy in termination proceedings. To prevail on her claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, respondent-appellant must show that her trial counsel's performance was deficient, that it fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and that the representation so prejudiced her that it denied her a fair trial. This entails proving that there is a reasonable probability that, but for her counsel's unprofessional errors, the result would have been different. *Id.* at 197-198.

Respondent-appellant's counsel's cross-examination, while brief in many instances, does not appear to us so deficient as to warrant reversal. Respondent-appellant does not suggest what questions should have been asked to keep the trial court from terminating her parental rights. Nor does she suggest what defense could have been raised with that same end in mind. She states she had four possible witnesses but she fails to reveal the substance of their proposed testimony. We will not search to discover and rationalize the basis of respondent-appellant's claims. *In re CR, supra* at 199. We do not see a reasonable probability of a different result. Therefore, respondent-appellant was not denied the effective assistance of counsel.

Affirmed.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra  
/s/ Michael J. Talbot  
/s/ Donald S. Owens